

-----Original Message-----

From: azstidger@mindspring.com [<mailto:azstidger@mindspring.com>]
Sent: Sunday, March 30, 2008 11:20 PM
To: Mike Chrisman; MLPAComments; governor
Subject: In Support of 2-XA

Dear Blue Ribbon Task Force,

I am writing you in support of Proposal 2-XA. In the last 4 yrs I have bought a fishing boat for my family. I have 2 boys that accompany me in the San Francisco bay and the nearby Pacific Ocean when the weather permits. My boys ages are 5 yrs and 8yrs. We cherish time spent on the water.

Last year we put close to 50 hrs on the boat. Most of this time was on the Northern Marin coast area. Were these areas and the Farallon Islands closed to us, I would be less likely to bring two young boys out into the Ocean for an all day excursion where the weather can change quickly. As it is we pick our days carefully and only venture outside the Golden Gate in the best conditions.

I was brought up fishing with my father and have fond memories of fishing the Pacific Ocean. I Hope to have many more trips with my sons.

Of all of the Proposals 2-XA is the most reasonable..

Thank you for your time.

Adrien Stidger
Sacramento, CA

From: Rainmaker Fernandez [<mailto:rainmakeral@sbcglobal.net>]
Sent: Sunday, March 30, 2008 8:53 PM
To: MLPAComments
Subject: Support for Proposal 2-XA

I support proposal 2-XA because it has protection for our fisheries as well as provide areas for sportfishing. I retired a couple of years ago and now that I finally get to enjoy my sport you want to shut it down. Do you people ever stop to look how much money goes into sportfishing that the state takes in. If you take away our fishing I don't know why I should go out and spend another \$ 43:50 for a fishing license next year. We want to protect our fishing so that our children and their children can enjoy the sport. I belong to a couple of fishing clubs so we are as much concern about problem. Try to use some common sense, first take a look what happens to all the water that goes south at the time the fish need it most. Second don't dump all the hatchery fish in the same spot or area, all you do is feeding the strippers and sea lions lunch. Give the fish a chance to get out to the ocean, that's the least you can do considering all the money it takes to raise them.

THANK YOU
AL FERNANDEZ
SAN LEANDRO, CA.

From: Archer Richardson [mailto:archerj@mcn.org]
Sent: Sunday, March 30, 2008 3:46 PM
To: MLPAComments
Subject: Support for Proposal 2XA

To all involved in the final decision:

After spending the last 6 months traveling to meeting after meeting, spending hours and hours on this process I still strongly believe the Proposal 2XA has the most to offer to all. The commercial fisherman, the sports fisherman, the economy and both the private and public property owners. We have a fantastic State and County Park system within this North Central Coast Study Region, actually I believe the park lands greatly outnumber the private property. The 2XA team has done a wonderful and diversified delivery of spreading the MPA placement within the region. Please take the final step in completing this task by endorsing Proposal 2XA

**Arch Richardson
Stewarts Point
(a stakeholder at heart)**

From: Bob and/or Darlene [mailto:band@shadel.com]
Sent: Sunday, March 30, 2008 5:08 PM
To: MLPAComments
Cc: Mike Chrisman
Subject:

Dear Task Force Members,
I am writing in of support Proposal 2-XA in your upcoming vote. I am a long time recreational fisherman and a concerned senior citizen who believes that Proposal 2-XA is the best alternative under consideration.
2-XA is the best balanced option.
2-XA addresses the important conservation requirements while respecting the impact on recreational fishermen.
2-XA has the potential to achieve most of the MLPA scientific conservation goals and meet the DFG guidelines.
2-XA is the most enforceable in that it has the greatest potential to gain the support of the concerned community groups involved.
Current alternate proposals which, in my opinion, carry a higher potential to cripple the commercial and recreational fishing community are not justified by the current situation.

--
Bob Shadel
San Francisco, Ca.

From: cynthia burnham [mailto:burnhamc@sbcglobal.net]
Sent: Sunday, March 30, 2008 3:28 PM
To: MLPAComments
Subject: 2-xa

My wife and I both support 2-XA.
Thanks
Brian Burnham

From: Bruce Turner [mailto:bruce@turnerbuilt.com]
Sent: Sunday, March 30, 2008 4:46 PM
To: MLPAComments
Subject: MLPA Proposals for Fishing

Dear Blue Ribbon Task Force,

I like and work on in the Half Moon Bay area and wish to ask your consideration for adopting proposal 2-XA. This proposal will have long lasting conservation guarantees, while maintaining a balance with appropriate considerations for commercial, sport, economic and recreational uses of the fishing resources that we all wish to preserve.

Thanks for your consideration,
Bruce Turner
Half Moon Bay, CA

From: Burt Olhiser [mailto:bolhiser@aol.com]
Sent: Sunday, March 30, 2008 12:03 PM
To: MLPAComments
Cc: governor@governor.ca.gov; Mike Chrisman
Subject: Support for Option 2XA

While I am not personally versed on all of the options for ergaluting our fishing waters I do strongly support the positions of the Coastside Fishing club as I have found them again and again to be balnced and fair in them. So I am voicing my support for Option 2-XA as urged by Bob Franko and the Club and after reading it's synopsis and contrsats with other options do find it to be what I would call the best option. I am a native Californian born and raised in San Francisco who has been fishing our waters since I was old enough to hold a pole. I certainly do not want to see the decline of our fishery but wish to do all I can individually and collectively to support it. But I especially want to see us be guarded in this endeavor that we don't over regulate as once done it's hell to reverse that course.

Thank you

*Burt Olhiser, Principal
Middletown, CA*

From: Candy & Larry Cadd [mailto:cadd@vbbn.com]
Sent: Sunday, March 30, 2008 10:01 AM

To: MLPAComments

Subject: Supporting Proposal 2XA

MLPA Task Force

This is my second response supporting the Proposal 2XA. The DFG posted the maps of the various closures so that we might better understand the differences between the various proposals. Under proposal #4 a private boater is restricted to waters relatively close to Bodega Bay (less than 20 miles) or forced to run more than 30 miles to get beyond the next closure above Proposal #4 Stewarts Point SMR. That area is sometimes relatively protected by Pt Arena and a small boater fishing inshore may not be aware of the changing sea conditions outside a few miles. By the time a boater realizes the wind is up, it could have really deteriorated farther south. Mussel Point and Bodega head can be quite treacherous on the run back to harbor from up north, especially if conditions have changed offshore and you add the time of an additional 10 miles to run. Far too many small boaters run south too close to shore in bad weather. In the effort to enjoy a nice day of fishing small boaters may be enticed to risk the extra miles and find themselves in trouble on the way back to harbor. I support Proposal 2XA in that on balance it strikes a safer approach and doesn't lead boaters into an unsafe situation. In addition to the safety aspect, Proposal 2XA strikes a balance in achieving the goals of the MLPA, is not overly restrictive to sport fishing, and respects the views of private property owners. Let's give this a try and see if the protections expected are achieved before entering into the more restrictive proposals. After all, we are only experimenting here, we need to let time, science, and research tell us if it is worth the effort. This is like taxes, they never get reduced.

Larry

From: Carl Malberg [mailto:cmalberg@pacbell.net]

Sent: Sunday, March 30, 2008 4:51 PM

To: MLPAComments

Cc: governor@governor.ca.gov; Mike Chrisman

Subject: Marine Life Protection Act (MLPA)

Attention Blue Ribbon Task Force,

For today's anglers and boaters, getting out on the water is a refreshing escape from the hustle and bustle of everyday life. Individually, spending the day fishing with family or friends, or just enjoying some time alone, may not seem like much, but just by doing what they love to do, anglers and boaters contribute \$20 billion per year to this nation's economy. We recreational fishermen are dedicated:

„X to conserving healthy fish populations through sound fishery management;

„X to good stewardship of our resources through sound angling practices;

„X to maintaining access to fish; and

„X to the 45 million licensed U.S. anglers who support fishery conservation with their license fees and taxes paid on sportfishing equipment.

Under the [California Marine Life Protection Act](#), California is in the process of designating marine protected areas, some of which will restrict access to recreational fishing.

The goal of California's sportfishing advocates and anglers is to protect the marine environment while minimizing unwarranted closures California's coastal waters to recreational fishing. The purpose of pursuing this goal is to:

- Maintain and improve the conservation of California marine fisheries and associated marine resources so as to improve the overall health of the ocean;
- Assure that the process for future closures or designations under California's Marine Life Protection Act relies on biological and economic information in a balanced fashion; and
- Increase sportfishing opportunities in California from their current economic and participation levels.

At \$336 million, California earns more state and local tax revenues from sportfishing than any other state. At \$2.7 billion, sportfishing retail sales are equivalent to the value of the state's grape harvest. This is not insignificant.

Deliberation and consensus are the keys to ensuring that conservation and protection of our ocean resources occurs now and in the future while still allowing for continued recreational fishing. We have just one chance to get it right. A decision by the California Fish and Game Commission to implement MPAs – especially no-take areas – without careful consideration and due process could have disastrous consequences for regional economies, recreational anglers and boaters.

I strongly and respectfully request that you adopt Proposal 2-XA.

Proposal 2-XA is a well balanced and strong conservation proposal that does not have significant adverse socioeconomic impacts on commercial and/or recreational fishermen and divers but:

„X Proposal 2-XA achieves the scientific and conservation goals of the MLPA

„X Proposal 2-XA meets Department of Fish and Game feasibility guidelines

„X Proposal 2-XA is enforceable and will have broad public support

„X Proposal 2-XA is the only proposal to have broad support from a wide range of fishing user groups

„X Proposal 2-XA has a strong backbone of marine reserves with seven core areas where a State Marine Reserve serves as the foundation of the MPA cluster

„X Proposal 2-XA places an emphasis on total ecosystem protection with an emphasis on the „High“ level of protection.

„X Proposal 2-XA places an emphasis on contributing to a network of MPAs in the "preferred" size range.

„X Proposal 2-XA has the support of a vast array of commercial and recreational fishermen/women and divers.

„X Proposal 2-XA and/or its individual components has the support of many in the conservation community.

For these many reasons, I urge you to adopt Proposal 2-XA

Sincerely,

Carl H. Malberg
Sunnyvale CA

From: Chris Leuterio [<mailto:leuterio@mac.com>]
Sent: Sunday, March 30, 2008 9:06 PM
To: MLPAComments
Subject: 2-xa support

I am a California Native, a lifelong hunter and fisherman, and father of three girls who also enjoy fishing. I have owned several boats in my life and have always made boating and fishing with family and friends my main pastime. This could all change unless you guys get behind proposal 2-xa.

Chris Leuterio

From: Charles Lung [<mailto:fishleboat@sbcglobal.net>]
Sent: Sunday, March 30, 2008 4:48 AM
To: MLPAComments
Subject: MLPA no fish areas

this whole closing of 25% areas is totally unconstitutional and needs to be cancelled.
Please consider the 2-XA recommendations of Coastside Fishing Club,OK? Chuck Lung
(Fishleboat)

From: Sally Friedley [<mailto:friedley@sbcglobal.net>]
Sent: Sunday, March 30, 2008 6:51 PM
To: MLPAComments
Subject: 2-XA

Task Force Commissioners,
I hope you support the 2-XA proposal for our coastal waters,It only makes sense for the health of our communities and the and the Salmon..Please vote responsibly and don't let

special interest over weigh the right thing to do..2-XA represents everyone in a fair and ethical way..Thank You, for your hard work and attention to this matter.2-XA is for everyone..

Best Regards,
Clifford Friedley.

From: Breschi@jps.net [mailto:Breschi@jps.net]
Sent: Sunday, March 30, 2008 1:14 PM
To: MLPAComments
Subject: Mipa area selections

Members of the Blue Ribbon Task Force please understand that many outdoors persons, are completely disturbed ,by the magnitude of endless outdoor area closures that we seem to be faced with recently . It seems that every thing we hear now is about some area, or season that will be closed to fishing or hunting .I do understand that we have to exercise caution to protect our outdoor resources, but in my opinion some of the current MLPA proposals go way too far!!!!!! For example ,in many areas along our coast there is very limited access to the ocean by boat, and in many cases you are suggesting that we close these areas to fishing. When you close the coast in and around our few ports and access points you have made an unsafe situation , by forcing boats to venture too far from their safe harbors, leaving them vulnerable to bad weather and rough seas. We may be preserving the coast, but we risk losing a generation of fishermen and outdoor enthusiasts in the process!!!!!! Please support the Coastside Fishing Club suggested proposal for the MLPA's and do what is reasonable for our costal resources.
Sincerely
Craig Breschi

From: D&M Wilgis [mailto:wilgis@dishmail.net]
Sent: Sunday, March 30, 2008 9:48 PM
To: 'Marsha Wilgis'
Cc: MLPAComments
Subject: Support Proposal 2-XA to preserve California's Rich Heritage of Ocean Access

Greetings,

I am asking everyone I know to help by writing letters of support for proposal 2-XA to the Blue Ribbon Task Force (BRTF) of the Marine Life Protection Act (MLPA).

If your unaware of what the MLPA is here is a summary as I know it; the voters of California passed a law that would create areas off the coast of California that are set aside for Marine Life conservation and habitat. As part of the process there has been a task force assembled to create proposals to be submitted to the California Department of Fish & Game. The task force has worked diligently to create these proposals and at the end of the day there are three proposals for phase 2 of the MLPA (Bay Area Coastline).

Proposal 1-3, Proposal 2-XA and Proposal 4;

Proposal 2-XA, is supported by the majority of people seeking a balance environment while creating long term sustainable recreational use (fishing, diving, shore access, collecting shells and beach access) Proposal 2-XA provides the highest conservation factor while minimizing the economic effects to local economies and fishermen.

Proposal 4 shuts down almost all of the available fishing areas to the small recreational boater and is more of a complete shut down of recreational use. The locations of their proposed protected areas will force many small boaters to travel farther than before creating dangerous situations for recreational fishermen. This is the most restrictive proposal even eliminating beach access and collecting shells. The conservation factor for proposal 4 even being the most restrictive is no better that the balanced approach of Proposal 2-XA

Proposal 1-3 is similar to proposal 2-XA but does not have as high of a conservation factor as 2-XA. Proposal 1-3 has unnecessary economic effects without improving the conservation factor and as such should not even be considered.

PLEASE Show your SUPPORT for PROPOSAL 2-XA by emailing a letter to

MLPAComments@resources.ca.gov

governor@governor.ca.gov

Mike.Chrisman@resources.ca.gov

Sincerely
Doug Wilgis

I have included more detailed information below;

Proposal 2-XA is a well balanced and strong conservation proposal that does not have significant adverse socioeconomic impacts on commercial and/or recreational fishermen and divers but:

Proposal 2-XA achieves the scientific and conservation goals of the MLPA

Proposal 2-XA meets Department of Fish and Game feasibility guidelines

Proposal 2-XA is enforceable and will have broad public support

Proposal 2-XA is the only proposal to have broad support from a wide range of fishing user groups

Proposal 2-XA has a strong backbone of marine reserves with seven core areas where a State Marine Reserve serves as the foundation of the MPA cluster

Proposal 2-XA places an emphasis on total ecosystem protection with an emphasis on the "High" level of protection.

Proposal 2-XA places an emphasis on contributing to a network of MPAs in the "preferred" size range.

Proposal 2-XA has the support of a vast array of commercial and recreational fishermen/women and divers.

Proposal 2-XA and/or its individual components have the support of many in the conservation community.

Major differences between 2-XA and other proposals:

Proposal 4 would close virtually all recreational bottom fishing at Duxbury Reef - the most important fishing area north of Point Conception and mean the virtual end of fishing out of San Francisco Bay.

Proposal 4 creates an MPA between Half Moon Bay and Ano Nuevo (in the Central Coast study area) which is not needed to meet SAT conservation guidance, with devastating impacts to Pillar Point harbor and users.

Proposal 2-XA has good solutions at Bodega Bay and Half Moon Bay whereas Proposal 4 would be devastating for the small boater and actually creates unsafe situations

Proposals 4 and 13 both place an MPA at Saunders Reef (an area protected by natural winds and typically rough water) resulting in a disproportionate impact to an area that was severely underrepresented on the Regional Stakeholder Group.

Proposal 2-XA is the only proposal to create an underwater park at Sea Ranch specifically designed for non-consumptive divers while leaving open the traditional public access used by consumptive divers south of Stewarts Point, and when coupled with the private lands to the south becomes a keystone MPA in the overall network. Proposals 13 and 4 impact recreational and commercial users to the highest degree by extending their SMR out to the state waters boundary. Only Proposal 2-XA has struck a real balance in this part of the study area which is reflected in a massive support from local residents, land owners, fishermen, and conservationists.

From: ECHS1973@aol.com [mailto:ECHS1973@aol.com]

Sent: Sunday, March 30, 2008 5:49 PM

To: Mike Chrisman; MLPAComments

Subject: Support 2-XA

March 30, 2008

MLPA Commission,
Secretary Mike Chrisman

To whom it may concern,

Please let me add another point in addition to my other comments. I will repeat, **I do not like any more restrictions on my right to fish.** After reviewing all the surviving proposals on the table, I again urge the members of the BRTF and the Fish and Game Commission to support **Proposal 2-XA.**

Proposal 2-XA clearly has the support of many fishing and dive user groups because it still **allows reasonable access** while addressing the conservation intent of the MLPA goals. I have a small ocean-going craft. **Small boat safety** was obviously considered when 2-XA was crafted.

The other proposals simply grab as much turf as possible regardless of consumptive users. Their agenda seems to be to keep all users off the ocean. The designers of 2-XA have delivered a plan that hurts all consumptive users in some way, but in a way where the pain is shared and users can live with it. **The brilliant part is they have crafted a solution with the smallest footprint while still maintaining ALL conservation goals of the MLPA law.** There is no need to shut down more areas than required. Let's wait and see if the protected areas work before the more radical or emotional closures are imposed.

Back to small boat safety. If the Duxbury reef area is restricted as in Proposal 4 for example, you take away a safe area that is reachable from those using SF Bay harbors. The Marin County coast usually enjoys calmer seas as it's in the shadow of Pt. Reyes. Swells coming down the coast are attenuated. If you close that area off, I have to travel further distance and more into harm's way considering ocean conditions. Getting back safely, if the weather deteriorates, becomes a big concern.

Proposal 2-XA is no doubt the best compromise. Consumptive users all share the pain and again it was designed with the smallest footprint on the map. If the more restrictive proposals are adopted, you'll never convince me that a predetermined political agenda drove this MLPA process based on the origins of the funding for the process.

Sincerely,

Dale Myer
Clayton, CA

From: Dave Del Carlo [mailto:gr8wyt@rcn.com]
Sent: Sunday, March 30, 2008 6:02 PM
To: MLPAComments
Cc: noreply@coastsidefishingclub.com; Mike Chrisman; governor@governor.ca.gov
Subject: The Blue Ribbon Task Force & Proposal 2-XA

The Blue Ribbon Task Force

To whom it may concern:

As an avid fisherman of the SF Bayarea for over 30 years, member of the SF Tyee Club, as well as member of The Coastside Fishing Club, and Commercial Salmon Permit holder (Ca. Lic.#L42107), I would like to express my support for Proposal 2-XA!

Thank you!

Sincerely,

Dave Del Carlo

From: LawKenyon@aol.com [mailto:LawKenyon@aol.com]
Sent: Sunday, March 30, 2008 5:34 PM
To: MLPAComments
Subject: Support 2-XA

I just wanted to register my strong support for measure 2-XA on the MLPA process.

Thanks

Dave Kenyon
Novato, CA

From: David Heckenlaible [mailto:joanheckenlaible@comcast.net]
Sent: Sunday, March 30, 2008 2:14 PM
To: MLPAComments
Subject: Fw: MLPA proposals

----- Original Message -----

From: [David Heckenlaible](#)
To: Mike.Chrisman@resources.ca.gov
Sent: Saturday, March 29, 2008 10:21 PM
Subject: MLPA proposals

As a Coastside member and recreational fisherman, I am in favor of MLPA proposal #2
David Heckenlaible
Lodi, CA

From: David Schwartz [mailto:david@schwartzandassociates.com]
Sent: Sunday, March 30, 2008 10:52 AM
To: MLPAComments
Subject: Please support Proposal 2-XA.

Please support Proposal 2-XA.

Support recreational fishing for our kids

David Schwartz

From: Dean Donaldson [mailto:highlandlassie@sbcglobal.net]

Sent: Sunday, March 30, 2008 6:47 PM

To: MLPAComments

Subject: Please vote for proposal 2-xa

My only enjoyment in life is fishing.

With the salmon situation grim, and them needing a break, I urge you to continue to let us fish for groundfish by allowing proposal 2-XA pass.

Please do not take our recreational fishing grounds away from us,

Thanks for your consideration.

Dean Donaldson

From: Dennis White [mailto:dennis_a_white@yahoo.com]

Sent: Sunday, March 30, 2008 8:13 PM

To: MLPAComments

Subject: MLPA Comment

All,

My name is Dennis White; I am writing this letter in support of Draft Proposal 2-XA. My understanding of the MLPA charter is that it is to preserve and protect our resources. I too have the same agenda for California waters. It makes sense that any consumptive users would also share that same philosophy. Any of the other proposals seem counter productive and unjustifiable in my opinion.

I started my commercial fishing career and the age of 16 and owned my first commercial boat by the time I was 18. I worked in the fishing industry for about 10 years until I realized that I loved the ocean and fishing too much to make it a job. My family has 5 living generations including my kids and grandparents that are regular consumptive users. Sport fishing and free diving is a family bonding experience for us, we use the public resources whenever we can. Much like other "sportsmen" we spend thousands of dollars each year to take our friends and family out fishing or diving.

Reading some of the other proposals I find myself saddened and disturbed by what I feel is a hidden agenda and a bias process. Proposal 2-XA is acceptable, however; the real issues are still not being addressed in my opinion. The water being pumped from the Delta and pumps are destroying not only fish stocks but habitat. Bottom trawlers continue practice destructive fishing methods. Condensing all consumptive users into smaller areas is not answer. Managing stocks with seasons and take restrictions not to mention banning destructive fishing methods such as bottom trawling.

I grew up surfing, fishing, and diving and these are all activities that I want to pass down to my kids. However, the massive funding driving this process seems to be distorting the facts. The minority that is funding the process seem determined to take away a public resource from those who only want it to thrive. I challenge anyone to find people that care more about the resource than those who spend thousands of their hard earned dollars each year enjoying it. Nobody wants healthier fish stocks or habitat than myself thus I find it stunning that sportsmen are targets of this process.

The MLPA is a very cumbersome process and reading all of the drafts and associated law is time consuming. However, my findings are that draft proposal 2XA exceeds the requirements all will allow acceptable boundaries to consumptive users. There is no other proposal that is acceptable to me or my family. I would be forced to spend my money and vacation time out of state to share the ocean with my family. It would be nice to see the real issues addressed like bottom trawling and water diversion.

Thanks and Regards

Dennis A White

From: don yee [mailto:dwy789@sbcglobal.net]
Sent: Sunday, March 30, 2008 11:07 AM
To: MLPAComments
Subject: Proposal 2-XA

Please support proposal 2-XA

dwy@yahoo.com

From: DOUG kuhl [mailto:doug63@sbcglobal.net]
Sent: Sunday, March 30, 2008 7:06 PM
To: MLPAComments
Subject: Proposal 2XA

I am retired and have been fishing the S.F. Ocean coastline for over 50 years. I have taken my daughter and have been looking forward to taking my 3 grandchildren fishing. I would like them to be able to enjoy the wonders of fishing and a day on the sea as I have. I am sure they in

turn will have a love of the sea and want to see it taken care of and passed down to their children.
I am asking that you consider proposal 2XA as that would still allow some reasonable access and yet meet the conservation goals we all are looking to achieve.

Thank You,

Doug Kuhl

From: Doug Parish [mailto:dougparish@sbcglobal.net]

Sent: Sunday, March 30, 2008 11:09 AM

To: MLPAComments

Subject: I support Proposal 2-XA

I support Proposal 2-XA for the following reasons:

Proposal 2-XA is a well balanced and strong conservation proposal that does not have significant adverse socioeconomic impacts on commercial and/or recreational fishermen and divers but:

Proposal 2-XA achieves the scientific and ♣ conservation goals of the MLPA

Proposal 2-XA meets Department of Fish and ♣ Game feasibility guidelines

Proposal 2-XA is enforceable and will have ♣ broad public support

Proposal 2-XA is the only proposal to have broad ♣ support from a wide range of fishing user groups

Proposal 2-XA has a strong ♣ backbone of marine reserves with seven core areas where a State Marine Reserve serves as the foundation of the MPA cluster

Proposal 2-XA places an ♣ emphasis on total ecosystem protection with an emphasis on the "High" level of protection.

Proposal 2-XA places an emphasis on contributing to a network ♣ of MPAs in the "preferred" size range.

Proposal 2-XA has the support of a ♣ vast array of commercial and recreational fishermen/women and divers.

♣ Proposal 2-XA and/or its individual components has the support of many in the conservation community.

Please consider the above when you vote.

Respectfully Submitted by **Douglas E. Parish**

F/V Gerlin located at Pillar Point Harbor, Half Moon Bay, CA.

Owner

Douglas E. Parish

San Jose, CA

From: douglas laughlin [mailto:duglas1@juno.com]
Sent: Sunday, March 30, 2008 10:20 PM
To: MLPAComments
Subject: Important

BRTF

My name is Douglas Laughlin. I'm writing this request in favor of the 2XA proposal for the north central portion of the MLPA. It is with a heavy heart that I write this. I have spent a lifetime on and under the waters of northern California, and those experiences have helped shape me into the person I am. It has been a life of the most incredible experiences I could never have imagined. I've introduced many people to the world I enjoyed, only to delight in their new-found joy. I've invested my life in being able to experience all the ocean has to offer, sometimes at a great price.

I'm now being asked to pay a price again. To sacrifice hundreds of square miles of the most accessible, fishable, self-sustaining, near-port, near-shore, near-home waters I've been accustomed to recreating in. For what? For the good of the fishery? I've been supporting good sustainable conservation. I've been abiding by the fish & game laws, paying license fees, following reduced bag and size limits, doing all the right things the experts have said. Now I find myself pleading with a new and present danger.....the MLPA. Why? Is California Dept. of Fish & Game no longer able to accurately manage the

states ocean resources. Does the MLPA have the better data? Does the world of non-profit, kayak, mammal, bird, whale, tree, you pick it foundations, consisting of hundreds of thousands of donating members of the non-ocean using public have the right to dictate to the respectful users of the coast's prime areas, their agenda? I'm sorry, but you see, if I have to pay the price again, I want to point out the selfish nature of the well-meaning landlubbers.

If you truly want to do what's best for California's coast, send up the 2XA proposal. Don't focus over-usage on smaller areas by closing a larger portion of the coast. I would like to see no closures at all, but know that won't happen. For the sake of all of California coastline's well being, please choose 2XA.

Thank you,
Douglas Laughlin
Moss Beach, Ca.

From: pmurray30@comcast.net [<mailto:pmurray30@comcast.net>]
Sent: Sunday, March 30, 2008 12:37 PM
To: MLPAComments
Cc: governor@governor.ca.gov; Mike Chrisman
Subject: Proposal 2-XA

To Members of the Blue Ribbon Task Force:

I am writing this letter in support of Proposition 2-XA. Here are some of the reasons I feel this is the best answer to the dilemma that faces us here in California.

Proposal 2-XA is well balanced and strong conservation proposal. It is a good compromise that will address the needs and concerns of all stakeholders. It achieves the scientific and conservation goals of the MLPA and is also feasible by the guidelines of the Department of Fish

and Game. Supported by a vast array of commercial and recreational fishing and diving user groups, is enforceable and has broad public support as well.

As a fisherman and outdoorsman, I am committed to preserving the environment. I love the ocean and would not want to do anything to harm our world for future generations. I believe Proposition 2-XA to be the answer needed to preserve our world and yet prevent significant adverse impacts on commercial and/or recreational fisherman and divers.

Please listen to your constituents and consider our position as you prepare to vote on this important issue.

Sincerely,

Edgar Murray Jr.
Hanford, CA

From: Frank Ledesma [mailto:ledesma6670@sbcglobal.net]
Sent: Sunday, March 30, 2008 3:52 PM
To: MLPAComments
Subject: In support of 2-XA

To Whom this may concern, I have been fishing in California for just about 40 years. I fully support proposal 2-XA. 2-XA supports marine reserves with seven core areas where a State Marine Reserve serves as the foundation of the MPA cluster. I am all for marine reserves, although I also love to fish and do not want to have the whole California coast slowly closed off for many of us fishermen and woman.

Thank You, Frank Ledesma

From: Fred Horio [mailto:cuonthewater@gmail.com]
Sent: Sunday, March 30, 2008 8:39 PM
To: MLPAComments
Subject: MLPA proposal

To Whom it may concern-

I would like to voice my oppinion as a recreational angler about the current MLPA proposals that this board is deciding on. I would like it known that I would very much support proposal 2-XA. I support this proposal for several reasons listed below.

From: Fredrick Vanhorn [mailto:teleni@pacbell.net]
Sent: Sunday, March 30, 2008 8:54 AM
To: MLPAComments
Subject: Support 2-XA...

To Whom It May Concern,

I've been following all the events that related to our salmon fishing. I have 2 daughter (16 & 17) that started fishing when they were 8 years old. They love fishing and diving and also enjoyed the eating part. They been asking me about what is going on with the salmon season and see if they will ever fish for salmon again. I am an average fisherman that love to take the family camping and enjoyed the outdoor. Rather I caught a salmon or not, it's the fact that we're out there with families and friends enjoying nature. After looking at all the prosposal, I found that 2-XA will be the way to go especially with an average fisherman and the reason is 1. Safety 2. Conseravation for all the species. " I support 2-XA.

Fred Vanhorn
Coastside Fishing Club

From: Valerie Furness [mailto:valfurness@comast.net]
Sent: Sunday, March 30, 2008 3:01 PM
To: MLPAComments
Subject: MPA

Sirs

As a 53 year old resident of the San Francisco bay area, it has been my privelage to enjoy salmon, halibut, striped bass, and bottom fishing, since I was 4 years old. My children now enjoy these activities with me.

Of the proposals you have to choose from in your last deliberations, please support 2-XA. The areas left to us to fish should not interfere with the stated missions of the MPA's.

Thankyou for your time and consideration.

Gary Furness,MD

From: George Wight [mailto:wight1@sbcglobal.net]
Sent: Sunday, March 30, 2008 8:38 PM
To: MLPAComments
Subject: 2-xa

as a long time california sportfisherman I am asking you please support proposal 2-xa! lets not have our sport fishing go the same direction as the economy..down! thank you.
George wight,
Antioch,Ca.

From: Gino Abad [mailto:geabad2@sbcglobal.net]
Sent: Sunday, March 30, 2008 9:24 PM
To: MLPAComments
Cc: governor@governor.ca.gov; Mike Chrisman
Subject: Proposal 2-XA

Blue Ribbon Task Force,

I am writing this message to express my support for proposal 2-XA. From what I have read it is the best plan for balancing the interests of all parties involved. My interests are to continue to enjoy fishing off shore in the San Francisco and Monterey Bay areas, watching my kids and grand kids enjoy the thrill of catching a salmon, which they enjoy eating, and sharing my catch with my extended family members.

I realize that choosing the way forward regarding the fishing regulations is complex. However, I believe that proposal 2-XA will meet the key objectives of the MLPA, DFG and the fishermen. I have lived in the San Francisco Bay for 59 years and I don't want to leave this special place. Being able to take my family out for a fishing expedition off shore is one of the main reasons why this is a special place. I hope you can help keep it that way by supporting proposal 2-XA.

Yours truly,
Gino Abad
Fremont, CA

From: greg gartrell [mailto:raulduke52@sbcglobal.net]
Sent: Sunday, March 30, 2008 11:12 AM
To: MLPAComments
Subject: proposal 2-XA

to; the Blue Ribbon Task Force

re: proposal 2-XA

i urge you to vote for proposal 2-XA.

in my perfect world, all of thes mlpa proposals would be forgotten.
in my perfect world, i still have access to all the oceans of
california. you, sadly, would be unemployed.

in my real world, the only proposal which holds any hope for
a citizen of california is proposal 2-XA.

this is the only balanced, enforceable, goal oriented, feasible,
economically non-toxic, proposal you have in front of you.

please do not make me ebay all my fishing, diving, crabbing
and boating gear.

i urge you to vote for proposal 2-XA.

respectfully,
greg gartrell
sacramento ca

From: ggiolli@comcast.net [mailto:ggiolli@comcast.net]
Sent: Sunday, March 30, 2008 2:36 PM
To: MLPAComments
Subject: In Support of 2-XA

To Whom It May Concern

As a recreational fisherman who has fished my entire life, first with my father and later in life with my kids I also consider myself a conservationist concerned about our oceans and rivers. I am in complete support of the MLPA proposal **2-XA**. I believe this proposal achieves the conservation goals with less impact on the commercial and recreational fishing.

Thank you

Guy Giolli

From: Herb8 [<mailto:herb8@jps.net>]
Sent: Sunday, March 30, 2008 6:48 AM
To: MLPAComments
Subject: 2XA

Blue Ribbon Task Force,

I fully realize the difficulty in striking a balance in most any project. Considering a variety of user groups, mentalities & unproven science makes this task even more daunting.

Sportsmen have long been the champions of preservation of resources while actually partaking in those resources recreationally, spiritually and consumptively. This should not be about protection for the sake of protection, but protection of the common heritage of

California which we share, sometimes differently than others.

Please accept my support for Option 2XA. It is apparent that this option is the best thought out, the most inclusive of all user groups and the best at striking that delicate balance between ecology and access. It meets and exceeds the science and conservation goals of the

MLPA, while incorporating the least socio-economic impact on sportsmen, coastal communities and marine related business.

We have a long way to go to counter some of man's negative influences on his environment.

Let's not eliminate sportsmen from being effective messengers and "realtime" stewards and observers of the habitat and its inhabitants. In my opinion, over-restricting access is the worst thing that could happen in the long fight ahead. Losing the next generation's involved interest is at risk.

Sincerely,

Herbert L Pierce

Lifelong sportsman and conservationist.

Herb

From: James Tarhalla [mailto:jbt@tarhalla.com]

Sent: Sunday, March 30, 2008 2:48 PM

To: MLPAComments

Subject: Proposal 2-XA

Proposal 2-XA is a well balanced and strong conservation proposal that does not have significant adverse socioeconomic impacts on commercial and/or recreational fishermen. Proposal 2-XA achieves the scientific and conservation goals of the MLPA, meets Department of Fish and Game feasibility guidelines, is enforceable and will have broad public support and has a strong backbone of marine reserves with seven core areas where a State Marine Reserve serves as the foundation of the MPA cluster.

Please don't kill California's sport fishery and the \$ 4,000,000,000.00 (that's four billion in case you lost count of the zeroes) industry it supports.

Jim Tarhalla
Merced, CA

From: Jim N/A [mailto:helicon01@pacbell.net]

Sent: Sunday, March 30, 2008 7:37 AM

To: MLPAComments

Cc: Mike Chrisman

Subject: Proposal 2-XA

March 30, 2008

Dear BRTF members,

Please Accept and Pass Proposal 2-XA to the California Fish and Game Commission.

The following factors were seriously considered by those that have direct knowledge of the ocean off the North Central Coast. It is not based on the premise that subregions should just be closed that proposal 4 is basically based on.

The MLPA process was accepted and passed without many of the public aware of the goals and intent of the process. This was apparent from the field poll that was conducted in 2007. The respondents in the poll supported recreational and commercial fishing and stated that pollution and other environmental factors were responsible.

Proposal 2-XA is a well balanced and strong conservation proposal that does not have significant adverse socioeconomic impacts on commercial and/or recreational fishermen and divers.

Proposal 2-XA achieves the scientific and conservation goals of the MLPA
Proposal 2-XA meets Department of Fish and Game feasibility guidelines
Proposal 2-XA is enforceable and will have broad public support
Proposal 2-XA is the only proposal to have broad support from a wide range of fishing user groups
Proposal 2-XA has a strong backbone of marine reserves with seven core areas where a State Marine Reserve serves as the foundation of the MPA cluster
Proposal 2-XA places an emphasis on total ecosystem protection with an emphasis on the "High" level of protection.
Proposal 2-XA places an emphasis on contributing to a network of MPAs in the "preferred" size range.
Proposal 2-XA has the support of a vast array of commercial and recreational fishermen/women and divers.
Proposal 2-XA and/or its individual components has the support of many in the conservation community.

Major differences between 2-XA and other proposals:

Proposal 4 would close virtually all recreational bottom fishing at Duxbury Reef – the most important fishing area north of Point Conception and mean the virtual end of fishing out of San Francisco Bay.

Proposal 4 creates an MPA between Half Moon Bay and Ano Nuevo (in the Central Coast study area) which is not needed to meet SAT conservation guidance, with devastating impacts to Pillar Point harbor and users.

Proposal 2-XA has good solutions at Bodega Bay and Half Moon Bay whereas Proposal 4 would be devastating for the small boater and actually creates unsafe situations

Proposals 4 and 13 both place an MPA at Saunders Reef (an area protected by natural

winds and typically rough water) resulting in a disproportionate impact to an area that was severely underrepresented on the Regional Stakeholder Group.

Proposal 2-XA is the only proposal to create an underwater park at Sea Ranch specifically designed for non-consumptive divers while leaving open the traditional public access used by consumptive divers south of Stewarts Point, and when coupled with the private lands to the south becomes a keystone MPA in the overall network. Proposals 13 and 4 impact recreational and commercial users to the highest degree by extending their SMR out to the state waters boundary. Only Proposal 2-XA has struck a real balance in this part of the study area which is reflected in a massive support from local residents, land owners, fishermen, and conservationists

Note: Duxbury reef is also a secondary fishing point for both charter and private boats fishing the islands. There are many times that high northwest winds make fishing the islands hazardous at best. Pt. Reyes provides a natural wind barrier and Duxbury/Pt. Reyes are alternate fishing areas. Please consider safety factors along with the other reasons listed above and use this proposal as a sound model for future MLPA zones.

I urge that each Task Force member seriously consider these points and provide the area with something that California Can be proud of now and into the future. A balanced plan like 2-XA versus an extremist plan that doesn't consider anything other than an agenda of just closure of areas "just because" would meet these goals.

Please Examine the three proposals closely and forward 2-XA since it is the best choice.

Thank You,
James Volberding

From: Jay Bromley [<mailto:jaybrom@saber.net>]
Sent: Sunday, March 30, 2008 8:03 PM
To: MLPAComments
Subject: MLPA

I support Proposal 2-XA as it seems to be the most balanced for all concerned.

Thank you
Jay Bromley
Ukiah, CA

From: ifitflysitdies@sbcglobal.net [<mailto:ifitflysitdies@sbcglobal.net>]
Sent: Sunday, March 30, 2008 11:38 AM
To: MLPAComments
Subject: I support 2-xa

I am urging you to vote for 2-xa. As a Avid fisherman,and diver.I enjoy being on the ocean.I enjoy showing the wonders of the Pacific,to new people,and kids. In

this time of gangs,drugs, It is very important to keep our fishing and hunting areas OPEN. The 2-xa proposal is a good compromise. Most everyone that I show these proposals,say that 2-xa is the one that they can live with. The other proposals would make it Not worth even going out.It would cause unnecessary eccomic hardship to thousands of people. I already have called off replacing my boat,with a new one. until I can see where I will be able to fish. It seems to me,If another proposal gets chosen, Their will be a lot of people that will fight to over throw these massive closed areas. We have already lost Ano Nuevo, most of Monterey,and Pt Sur. If we get some other proposal,then 2-xa. You will have tens of thousands of Very Upset anglers,that will join with southern californi,to get this thing overthrown. I urge you to vote for 2-xa. Thank you for your time,
Jay Morgan.

From: jeff simonsen [mailto:jeffsimonsen@sbcglobal.net]
Sent: Sunday, March 30, 2008 7:00 PM
To: MLPAComments
Subject: Blue Ribbon Task Force

Dear sirs,

I am writing to express my support for the 2-XA proposal as this seems to be the fairest conservation measure. I have not followed too closely but am a proponent of conservation of our precious resource. I have been blessed to be of a generation which was allowed carte blanche to the resource, there's no question it has been abused,I think mainly from sheer numbers due to population growth. I only hope that my grandkids will have opportunity to fish somewhere when they're growing up. Please consider the 2-XA proposal.

sincerely,

Jeff Simonsen
Sebastopol, Ca.

From: Jerry Hanlon [mailto:jerryathanlon@sbcglobal.net]
Sent: Sunday, March 30, 2008 9:03 AM
To: MLPAComments
Subject: Retired to Fish

Good Morning:
Please support the MLPA Initiative, Proposal 2-XA.

I am retired and now a recreational fisherman. One of my goals is to teach younger generations some of the fishing skills and share the fun experiences on the ocean. I primarily fish the San Francisco Ocean area (Duxbury Reef/Double Point) and the

Monterey Bay via my trailerable Cabo 226.

I understand the need to protect the ocean environment and the fish stocks. I strongly support Proposal 2-XA of the present MLPA Initiative.

Respectfully,
Jerry Hanlon
Livermore, CA

From: Kulm [mailto:kulm@mindspring.com]
Sent: Sunday, March 30, 2008 3:13 PM
To: MLPAComments
Cc: governor@governor.ca.gov; Mike Chrisman
Subject: MLPA - Proposal 2-XA

Attn: Blue Ribbon Task Force,

I support Proposal 2-XA because it is a well balanced and strong conservation proposal that does not have significant adverse socioeconomic impacts on commercial and/or recreational fishermen and divers but:

Proposal 2-XA achieves the scientific and conservation goals of the MLPA

Proposal 2-XA meets Department of Fish and Game feasibility guidelines

Proposal 2-XA is enforceable and will have broad public support

Proposal 2-XA is the only proposal to have broad support from a wide range of fishing user groups

Proposal 2-XA has a strong backbone of marine reserves with seven core areas where a State Marine Reserve serves as the foundation of the MPA cluster

Proposal 2-XA places an emphasis on total ecosystem protection with an emphasis on the "High" level of protection.

Proposal 2-XA places an emphasis on contributing to a network of MPAs in the "preferred" size range.

Proposal 2-XA has the support of a vast array of commercial and recreational fishermen/women and divers.

Proposal 2-XA and/or its individual components has the support of many in the conservation community.

Major differences between 2-XA and other proposals:

Proposal 4 would close virtually all recreational bottom fishing at Duxbury Reef – the most important fishing area north of Point Conception and mean the virtual end of fishing out of San Francisco Bay.

Proposal 4 creates an MPA between Half Moon Bay and Ano Nuevo (in the Central Coast study area) which is not needed to meet SAT conservation guidance, with devastating impacts to Pillar Point harbor and users.

Proposal 2-XA has good solutions at Bodega Bay and Half Moon Bay whereas Proposal 4 would be devastating for the small boater and actually creates unsafe situations ¶; Proposals 4 and 13 both place an MPA at Saunders Reef (an area protected by natural winds and typically rough water) resulting in a disproportionate impact to an area that was severely underrepresented on the Regional Stakeholder Group.

Proposal 2-XA is the only proposal to create an underwater park at Sea Ranch specifically designed for non-consumptive divers while leaving open the traditional public access used by consumptive divers south of Stewarts Point, and when coupled with the private lands to the south becomes a keystone MPA in the overall network. Proposals 13 and 4 impact recreational and commercial users to the highest degree by extending their SMR out to the state waters boundary. Only Proposal 2-XA has struck a real balance in this part of the study area which is reflected in a massive support from local residents, land owners, fishermen, and conservationists.

Best Regards,
Jerry Kulm

From: annie [mailto:farmerar@cwnet.com]
Sent: Sunday, March 30, 2008 2:06 PM
To: Governor@governor.ca.gov; Mike Chrisman; MLPAComments
Cc: noreply@coastsidefishingclub.com
Subject: 2-XA letter

March 30,2008

Proposal 2-XA

The fishing opportunities in California have completely falling apart. The fish and game does not seem to want to accept the fact that the Sports fishermen/women puts as much in the economy as the Commercial fisherman.

Somehow there must be a way to manage this situation, and at the present time, we feel that 2-XA is be the best avenue to help solve the fishing situation.

We've fished for over 60 years, we'd hate to see it end now.

Jim and Ann Ronsse,
Chicago park CA.

From: Jim Hamrick [mailto:hamrick990@comcast.net]
Sent: Sunday, March 30, 2008 1:40 PM
To: MLPAComments
Subject: Support for Proposal 2-XA

I am writting this email to urge you to support Proposal 2-XA. This is a well balanced conservation proposal that does not significantly adverse the recreational fisherman while achieving scientific goals of the MLPA. It is enforceable and will have broad public support.

Thank you for your consideration.

Jim Hamrick

From: John Blair [mailto:jblair@executivestrategies.com]
Sent: Sunday, March 30, 2008 12:27 PM
To: MLPAComments
Cc: governor@governor.ca.gov; Mike Chrisman
Subject: Support Proposal MLPA 2-XA

Dear Task Force Members,

I strongly urge you to support Proposal 2-XA in your upcoming vote. I have been a recreational fisherman for more than 50 years and based on that experience, I believe that Proposal 2_XA is the 'least-worst alternative' to address a difficult situation. It is the most balanced option which addresses both conservation requirements and socioeconomic impacts on commercial and recreational fishermen.

Of all the proposals offered, 2-XA achieves the most of the MLPA scientific and conservation goals and the DFG guidelines. Further it is the most enforceable and I believe will be the most likely to gain the support of the various communities/groups involved.

Thank you for your consideration.
Kind Regards –John Blair

John A. Blair

From: John Knox [mailto:jhknox@sbcglobal.net]
Sent: Sunday, March 30, 2008 12:07 PM
To: MLPAComments

Cc: governor@governor.ca.gov; Mike Chrisman

Subject: Support for Proposal 2-XA

Greetings:

I am writing to urge you in the strongest way possible to support Proposal 2-XA in the upcoming deliberations regarding the implementation of the MLPA on our coast. Proposal 2-XA is a well crafted, balanced and significant conservation proposal that does not have major adverse socioeconomic impacts on recreational fishermen. It provides for seven well protected core areas while preserving the viability and safety of reasonable recreational fishing in our waters.

Recreational fishing is an important pastime for thousands of people in our area, which provides significant economic activity, as well as getting many people out onto our beautiful waters. Getting out on a fishing trip fosters an increased awareness of the beauty and natural wonders beyond our shore, and actually encourages support for conservation and protection. If some of the other proposals you are considering are adopted, it is very likely that the entire recreational fishing industry will collapse, forever shutting off the access point for thousands of citizens to this offshore experience. Moreover, it might well foster resentment among the thousands of recreational fisherman, which will serve to polarize them against future conservation measures.

Recreational fishermen such as myself are very pro conservation, but we are not fanatics who would completely shut out access to everyone to our offshore resources. Please strike a reasonable balance and approve Proposal 2-XA. It is the best, most defensible, and most rational approach to protecting our resources while preserving a vital and beneficial pastime for thousands of people, and an important economic engine for many of our coastside communities.

Regards,

John H. Knox, Esq.
Point Richmond, CA

From: John Lyons [mailto:johnrlyons@sbcglobal.net]

Sent: Sunday, March 30, 2008 6:37 PM

To: MLPACComments

Cc: Mike Chrisman

Subject: Support for Proposal 2-XA.....

Blue Ribbon Task Force.....

I sending this email to voice my support for proposal 2-XA, and hope you will do the same. There is a tremendous amount at risk if this proposal is not implemented. The economic implications of other proposals could be disastrous. Not only that, this proposal seems to be the only one that works for a "win-win" situation and is the most reasonable compromise among the proposals.

Please support this proposal!!!

Sincerely,
John Lyons
Montara, CA

From: J Tassoni [mailto:jtassoni@sbcglobal.net]
Sent: Sunday, March 30, 2008 10:34 AM
To: MLPAComments
Subject: Yes on proposal 2-XA

Of all the proposals that I have reviewed it is plain to me that Proposal 2-XA satisfies all the criteria outlined in sustaining a healthy fishery and allowing myself and other fishers the enjoyment and health of being on the water and getting fresh seafood on the table for my family.

Sincerely Yours,
John Tassoni
Woodside, CA

From: Joseph Fecteau [mailto:joebiggidybob@yahoo.com]
Sent: Sunday, March 30, 2008 3:27 PM
To: MLPAComments
Subject:

To whom It May Concern my name is Joseph Fecteau, I am a diver and a fisherman. I believe that proposal 2-XA is a well balanced and strong conservation proposal that does not have significant adverse socioeconomic impacts on commercial and/or recreational fishermen and divers. Proposal 2-XA achieves the scientific and conservation goals of the MLPA. It meets Department of Fish and Game feasibility guidelines; it is enforceable and will have broad public support. Proposal 2-XA is the only proposal to have broad support from a wide range of fishing user grope and has a strong backbone of marine reserves with seven core areas where a State Marine Reserve serves as the foundation of the MPA cluster. Proposal 2-XA places an emphasis on total ecosystem protection with an emphasis on the "High" level of protection. Proposal 2-XA places an emphasis on contributing to a network of MPAs in the "preferred" size range and has the support of a vast array of commercial and recreational fishermen/women and divers. Proposal 2-XA and/or its individual components has the support of many in the conservation community. Only Proposal 2-XA has struck a real balance in this part of the study area which is reflected in a massive support from local residents, land owners, fishermen, and conservationists.

Thank you for your time,
Sincerely Joseph Fecteau

From: Julie Logue-Riordan [mailto:logueriordan@yahoo.com]

Sent: Sunday, March 30, 2008 11:24 AM

To: MLPAComments

Subject:

Dear B.R.T.F.:

I urge you to approve Proposal 2-XA. It meets and exceeds the science and conservation goals of the MLPA, while incorporating the least socio-economic impact on fisherman, coastal communities and marine related business. It strikes a balance between preservation, conservation, and sustainable use; the other proposals do not.

Proposal 2-XA meets Department of Fish and Game feasibility guidelines and it is enforceable. This is the only proposal to have broad support from a wide range of user groups.

Sincerely yours,

Julie Logue-Riordan

From: kstone6779@comcast.net [mailto:kstone6779@comcast.net]

Sent: Sunday, March 30, 2008 12:56 PM

To: MLPAComments

Subject: Proposal 2-XA

Ken Stone
6779 Tory Way
Dublin, CA 94568

March 30, 2008

MLPA Task Force,

I am 100% for Proposal 2-XA. Proposal 2-XA meets the Department of Fish and Game guidelines and is enforceable and will have broad public support.

Thank you,
Ken Stone

From: kstone6779@comcast.net [mailto:kstone6779@comcast.net]
Sent: Sunday, March 30, 2008 12:58 PM
To: MLPAComments
Subject: Proposal 2-XA

Ken Stone
6779 Tory Way
Dublin, CA 94568

March 30, 2008

MLPA Task Force,
I am 100% in favor of Proposal 2-XA.
Proposal 2-XA is the only proposal to have broad support from a wide range of fishing user groups.

I am against Proposal 4 as this creates an MPA between Half Moon Bay and Ano Nuevo (which is in the Central Coast study area) which is not needed to meet SAT conservation guidance, with devastating impacts to Pillar Point Harbor and users.
Thank you,
Ken Stone

From: kstone6779@comcast.net [mailto:kstone6779@comcast.net]
Sent: Sunday, March 30, 2008 1:01 PM
To: MLPAComments
Subject: Proposal 2-XA

Ken Stone
6779 Tory Way
Dublin, CA 94568

March 30, 2008

MLPA Task Force,
I am for Proposal 2-XA
Proposal 2-XA has a strong backbone of marine reserves with seven core areas where a State Marine Reserve serves as the foundation of the MPA cluster and Proposal 2-XA places an emphasis on total ecosystem protection with an emphasis on the "High" level of protection.
Thank You,
Ken Stone

From: kstone6779@comcast.net [mailto:kstone6779@comcast.net]
Sent: Sunday, March 30, 2008 1:03 PM
To: MLPAComments
Subject: Proposal 2-XA

Ken Stone
6779 Tory Way
Dublin, CA 94568

March 30, 2008

MLPA Task Force,
I am for Proposal 2-XA.
Proposal 2-XA places an emphasis on contributing to a network of MPAs in the
"preferred" size range.
Thank You,
Ken Stone

From: kstone6779@comcast.net [mailto:kstone6779@comcast.net]
Sent: Sunday, March 30, 2008 1:06 PM
To: MLPAComments
Subject: Proposal 2-XA

Ken Stone
6779 Tory Way
Dublin, CA 94568

March 30, 2008

MLPA Task Force,
I am for Proposal 2-XA
Proposal 2-XA has the support of a vast array of commercial and recreational
fishermen/women and divers.
Proposal 2-XA and/or its individual components has the support of many in the
conservation community.
Only Proposal 2-XA has struck a real balance in this part of the study area which is
reflected in a massive support from local residents, land owners, fishermen, and
conservationists.

I am against Proposal 4 and 13.
Proposal 4 would be devastating for the small boater and actually creates unsafe
situations.
Proposals 4 and 13 both place an MPA at Saunders Reef (an area protected by natural
winds and typically rough water) resulting in a disproportionate impact to an area that
was severely underrepresented on the Regional Stakeholder Group.
Proposals 13 and 4 impact recreational and commercial users to the highest degree by
extending their SMR out to the state waters boundary.
Thank You,
Ken Stone

From: kstone6779@comcast.net [mailto:kstone6779@comcast.net]
Sent: Sunday, March 30, 2008 12:54 PM
To: MLPAComments
Subject: Proposal 2-XA

Ken Stone
6779 Tory Way
Dublin, CA 94568

March 30, 2008

MLPA Task Force,
I am 100% in favor of Proposal 2-XA. This achieves the scientific and conservation goals of the MLPA.

I am 100% against Proposal 4. This would close virtually all recreational fishing areas north of Point Conception and mean the virtual end of fishing out of San Francisco Bay.

Thank You,
Ken Stone

From: Lloyd Fisher [mailto:fisherlr@live.com]
Sent: Sunday, March 30, 2008 6:52 PM
To: MLPAComments
Subject: Support Proposal 2-XA

Blue Ribbon Task Force,

Please accept my support for Proposal 2-XA. It is apparent that this Proposal is the best thought out, the most inclusive of all user groups and the best at meeting that delicate balance between ecology and access.

It meets and exceeds the science and conservation goals of the MLPA, while incorporating the least socio-economic impact on sportsman, coastal communities and marine related business.

In my opinion, over restricting access without proven scientific data, is the worst thing that could happen in our efforts to improve our coastal fisheries for the present and future generations.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Lloyd R. Fisher

Lifelong coastal fisherman

From: Lynn Marie [mailto:vlmarie@foss.com]
Sent: Sunday, March 30, 2008 5:52 PM
To: MLPAComments
Subject: MPLA comments - 2-XA

Eight of us here on the tugboat, Lynn Marie of San Francisco. We are die hard sportsman and urge the committee to approve plan 2-XA!

LET US FISH!

From: kim lovelace [mailto:kim.lovelace@yahoo.com]
Sent: Sunday, March 30, 2008 5:33 PM
To: MLPAComments; fgc@fgc.ca.gov
Subject: Proposal 2XA

To Whom It May Concern,

Four generations of our family have had the privilege to explore, learn, teach, respect and love properties included in the proposal 2XA. Thank you to the people who put this proposal together, they understand the environment and its needs. We believe that it would be a huge mistake to close these properties, not only for the public but also private owners. We have witnessed how well maintained and flourishing these properties are.

Ther properties included in Proposal 2XA are very special to our family and friends who have respected and loved the ocean and its resources. It breaks our heart to think that the day may come where we will not be able to pass these unforgettable experiences to our children's children.

Proposal 2XA meets the necessary requirements as outlined in the policies of the MLPA and takes the least amount of coastline. Shouldn't we put more efforts and resources in protecting lands that have been over consumed?

Please support proposal 2XA, the properties included in this proposal have, for decades, effectively conserved marine life as well as anyone.

Thank You,

Marc, Kim & Conner Lovelace

From: mike chin [mailto:mikechin2000@hotmail.com]
Sent: Sunday, March 30, 2008 9:04 PM
To: MLPAComments; Mike Chrisman
Subject:

MLPA
Initiative

North Central Coast Study

c/o
California Resources Agency

1416 Ninth St., Suite 1311

Sacramento, CA 95814My name is Michael Chin, and I am a fisherman and kayaker. I have lived my entire life here in the San Francisco Bay Area. I learned to fish from my dad when I was a kid in the 60's, and fished and backpacked all over the state until college. In the mid-80's I started river kayaking with the Sierra Club, and paddled rivers all over the western states for the next 20 years. In the last 15 years I rediscovered fishing, and along with many others recently, have combined kayaking with fishing. I own 5 kayaks for both river and ocean, belong to a local kayak club Bay Area Sea Kayakers, and am a Sierra Club member since the 80's My wife is also a kayaker, and our 2 year old daughter often accompanies us on paddles in the Bay and Pt Reyes.

I urge adoption of 2XA. It provides numerous SMR's satisfying the scientific and conservation goals of the MLPA, yet preserves the access to the relatively few diving and fishing areas on the North Coast reachable by kayak.

Specifically I refer to competing proposals that would limit access at Salt Point, Bodega Head, Double Point, and Duxbury

Please recommend proposal 2XA to the BRTF.

Thank you
Michael Chin

From: Mike Elfers [mailto:elf279@yahoo.com]
Sent: Sunday, March 30, 2008 7:05 AM
To: MLPAComments
Subject: Proposal 2-XA

Hello All,

I support Proposal 2-XA. The most important to me and my son is protecting the ecosystem and supporting weak fish stocks. I support MPA's where reasonable, and supported by science. I am a firm believer in maintaining healthy fish population levels. I believe Proposal 2-XA is the most reasonable, achieving the goals of the MLPA, meets DF&G guidelines, puts restrictions where they will help the most, and is supported by sound scientific models, has been peer reviewed by those who most understand the marine ecosystem, and yet still allows for reasonable fishing opportunities.

Thank you,

Mike Elfers
Vacaville, CA

From: Nina Adelman Stolar [<mailto:nstolar@yahoo.com>]
Sent: Sunday, March 30, 2008 8:07 PM
To: MLPAComments
Subject: MLPA Initiative Support for Proposal 2-XA

Ms. Nina Stolar
515 South 15th Street
San Jose, CA 95112

March 31, 2008

MLPA Initiative
c/o California Resources Agency
1416 Ninth Street, Suite 1311
Sacramento, CA 95814

To: Members of the Blue Ribbon Task Force
Subject: MLPA Initiative - Support for Proposal 2-XA

I was born and raised in California and have spent an increasing amount of time in the outdoors, especially camping and fishing. From personal experience and hosting many international visitors to the area I know our natural resources are the treasures of our state to be both shared and protected.

The variety of special interests in particular areas makes it crucial to have a broad spectrum of support for the recommendation of this task force. I strongly encourage your support for Proposal 2-XA because it is the only proposal to have support from many in the conservation community and from a wide range of fishing user groups including a vast array of commercial and recreational fishermen/women and divers.

Proposals 13 and 4 impact recreational and commercial users to the highest degree by extending their SMR out to the state waters boundary. Only Proposal 2-XA has struck a real balance in this part of the study area which is reflected in massive support from local residents, land owners, fishermen and conservationists.

Your role as a participant on the Blue Ribbon Task Force is crucial and will have a far reaching impact on public use of our natural resources. Please endorse proposal 2-XA which reflects a balanced outcome for the many Californians affected by this decision.

Respectfully,
Nina Stolar
San Jose, CA

cc: Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger
Mike Chrisman, Resources Agency

Nina Adelman Stolar

From: Nicole Berry [mailto:nikki_berry@sbcglobal.net]

Sent: Sunday, March 30, 2008 6:47 PM

To: MLPAComments

Subject: Proposal 2-XA

March 30, 2008

To Whom It May Concern,

I am writing to express my belief in **Proposal 2-XA**. The goal to consider, is finding a delicate balance for fisherman, residents, land owners, and conservationists.

If we think about history, the American Indians main food source was fish. Their practice was to fish in the same areas without moving to a different location. My tribe paid tribute to the salmon with a ceremony to commemorate the gift of the journey from the Pacific Ocean to the rivers.

My dad made sure to take his twin girls fishing when we were young to continue this tradition. It was a time when all of our family would wake up early, to go spend time together. Being around water taught us a certain respect. We learned about the beauty and peacefulness of what nature has to offer and we learned to value the strength and danger that the water has. We grew up to learn how to swim and to know limits around water. The prize of catching fish is the most exciting feeling one may ever have. To bring fish home to have a meal was a rewarding, happy time for us.

Those valuable lessons are what molded us into the people we are today. As an adult, I continue to fish and have the opportunity fish in the ocean. I have taught my son how to fish, to respect the water, and to value the environment.

We plan our vacations to some of the communities that are threatened by closure of these waters. Who has the right to attempt to take nature away? Not all of us have the ability to boat far into the ocean. If these areas are not available to us then we will be forced to go out of state to enjoy this form of recreation. That would reduce revenue for these oceanic cities. The effect of loss on communities will alter the way of life for many. We need to be able to utilize these natural resources to make California a destination not only for the residents of the state but also for tourism.

Having high ecosystem protection is important and is found with Proposal 2-XA. It will provide a guideline for the Department of Fish and Game to meet necessary standards to ensure adequate protection for our waters. It is the best choice that will allow us to carry on traditions to our children. It allows for valuable teachings of what real fun is. To go outside, to learn about the water, to get exercise, to engage one's mind and body in sport that holds value for the family.

We do not want to erase the picture of our past.

Respectfully,

Nicole (Nikki) Berry

From: Paul Helbig [mailto:pah5@comcast.net]
Sent: Sunday, March 30, 2008 12:11 PM
To: MLPAComments
Cc: Governor@Governor.Ca.Gov; Mike Chrisman
Subject: Blue Ribbon Task Force - Proposal 2-XA

I'm a sport fisherman and respectfully request your support of Proposal 2-XA for the following reasons.

Proposal 2-XA is a well balanced and strong conservation proposal that does not have significant adverse socioeconomic impacts on commercial and/or recreational fishermen and divers but:

Proposal 2-XA achieves the scientific and conservation goals of the MLPA

Proposal 2-XA meets Department of Fish and Game feasibility guidelines

Proposal 2-XA is enforceable and will have broad public support

Proposal 2-XA is the only proposal to have broad support from a wide range of fishing user groups

Proposal 2-XA has a strong backbone of marine reserves with seven core areas where a State Marine Reserve serves as the foundation of the MPA cluster

Proposal 2-XA places an emphasis on total ecosystem protection with an emphasis on the "High" level of protection.

Proposal 2-XA places an emphasis on contributing to a network of MPAs in the "preferred" size range.

Proposal 2-XA has the support of a vast array of commercial and recreational fishermen/women and divers.

Proposal 2-XA and/or its individual components has the support of many in the conservation community.

Major difference! s betw een 2-XA and other proposals:

Proposal 4 would close virtually all recreational bottom fishing at Duxbury Reef – the most important fishing area north of Point Conception and mean the virtual end of fishing out of San Francisco Bay.

Proposal 4 creates an MPA between Half Moon Bay and Ano Nuevo (in the Central Coast study area) which is not needed to meet SAT conservation guidance, with devastating impacts to Pillar Point harbor and users.

Proposal 2-XA has good solutions at Bodega Bay and Half Moon Bay whereas Proposal 4 would be devastating for the small boater and actually creates unsafe situations

Proposals 4 and 13 both place an MPA at Saunders Reef (an area protected by natural winds and typically rough water) resulting in a disproportionate impact to an area that was severely underrepresented on the Regional Stakeholder Group.

Proposal 2-XA is the only proposal to create an underwater park at Sea Ranch specifically designed for non-consumptive divers while leaving open the traditional public access used by consumptive divers south of Stewarts Point, and when coupled with the private lands to the south becomes a keystone MPA in the overall network. Proposals 13 and 4 impact recreational and commercial users to the highest degree by extending their SMR out to the state waters boundary. Only Proposal 2-XA has struck a real balance in this part of the study area which is reflected in a massive support from local residents, land owners, fishermen, and conservationists.

Thank you,

Paul Helbig

From: PAUL JENSEN [mailto:pauljens99@msn.com]
Sent: Sunday, March 30, 2008 12:13 PM
To: MLPAComments
Subject: MLPA Initiative - Support for Proposal 2-XA

I am a kayak and surf fisherman, primarily in Sonoma and Marin counties. I support adoption of Proposal 2-XA for the North Central Coast Phase of the MLPA.

I support 2-XA because this proposal satisfies the requirements of the MLPA and is the most strongly supported by the greatest number of recreational and commercial fishers and divers.

The MLPA requires the cooperation of the affected citizenry to succeed. Proposal 2-XA has the best chance to ensure the success of the MLPA, precisely because it is the most acceptable to the largest number of people who are materially involved with the areas designated by the MLPA.

Sincerely,

Paul Jensen
Santa Rosa, CA 95407

Paul Jensen
Santa Rosa, CA

From: Paul Stefani [mailto:paulstefani1@comcast.net]
Sent: Sunday, March 30, 2008 12:32 PM
To: MLPAComments
Cc: Mike Chrisman
Subject: new fishing reg

Proposal 2-XA is a well balanced and strong conservation proposal that does not have significant adverse socioeconomic impacts on commercial and/or recreational fishermen and divers but:

 Proposal 2-XA achieves the scientific and conservation goals of the MLPA
 Proposal 2-XA meets Department of Fish and Game feasibility guidelines
 Proposal 2-XA is enforceable and will have broad public support
 Proposal 2-XA is the only proposal to have broad support from a wide range of fishing user groups
 Proposal 2-XA has a strong backbone of marine reserves with seven core areas where a State Marine Reserve serves as the foundation of the MPA cluster
 Proposal 2-XA places an emphasis on total ecosystem protection with an emphasis on the "High" level of protection.
 Proposal 2-XA places an emphasis on contributing to a network of MPAs in the "preferred" size range.
 Proposal 2-XA has the support of a vast array of commercial and recreational fishermen/women and divers.
 Proposal 2-XA and/or its individual components has the support of many in the conservation community.

Major differences between 2-XA and other proposals:

 Proposal 4 would close virtually all recreational bottom fishing at Duxbury Reef - the most important fishing area north of Point Conception and mean the virtual end of fishing out of San Francisco Bay.
 Proposal 4 creates an MPA between Half Moon Bay and Ano Nuevo (in the Central Coast study area) which is not needed to meet SAT conservation guidance, with devastating impacts to Pillar Point harbor and users.
 Proposal 2-XA has good solutions at Bodega Bay and Half Moon Bay whereas Proposal 4 would be devastating for the small boater and actually creates unsafe situations
 Proposals 4 and 13 both place an MPA at Saunders Reef (an area protected by natural winds and typically rough water) resulting in a disproportionate impact to an area that was severely underrepresented on the Regional Stakeholder Group.
 Proposal 2-XA is the only proposal to create an underwater park at Sea Ranch specifically designed for non-consumptive divers while leaving open the traditional public access used by consumptive divers south of Stewarts Point, and when coupled

with the private lands to the south becomes a keystone MPA in the overall network. Proposals 13 and 4 impact recreational and commercial users to the highest degree by extending their SMR out to the state waters boundary. Only Proposal 2-XA has struck a real balance in this part of the study area which is reflected in a massive support from local residents, land owners, fishermen, and conservationists.

I obviously earge you to to take 2-XA,
Paul Stefani
Sebastopol Ca.

From: Philip Wilson [mailto:seamount@bigplanet.com]
Sent: Sunday, March 30, 2008 12:11 PM
To: MLPAComments
Subject: MLPA process/support for 2-XA

Gentlemen,

I am very concerned about the MLPA process that is taking place in California. I am a recreational fisherman who lives in the California Gold Country. I have been fishing in the Salt Water and diving for Abalone for almost 40 years. This hobby, avocation has become a big part of my life. I invested in a very nice boat about 20 years ago. I worked 40 years and finally retired with the dream of now spending some very good quality time fishing. I have enjoyed great fishing; and many fantastic days on the water over the years and am very concerned about the opportunity to enjoy it in the future. It seems like to me that this process is pretty much ignoring the in put from the recreational contingent. In my opinion we have very little impact on the resource. I can see the need for some "State Parks" for the marine resource but makes no sense to me to completely shut out a reasonable take of sport fish in those Parks. Especially since we are already governed and regulated by the Fish and Game. I hope you will listen and consider the small impact users like my self. For these reasons I support option 2-XA. The reasons I support 2-XA are outlined below:

Proposal 2-XA achieves the scientific and conservation goals of the MLPA
Proposal 2-XA meets Department of Fish and Game feasibility guidelines
Proposal 2-XA is enforceable and will have broad public support
Proposal 2-XA is the only proposal to have broad support from a wide range of fishing user groups
Proposal 2-XA has a strong backbone of marine reserves with seven core areas where a State Marine Reserve serves as the foundation of the MPA cluster
Proposal 2-XA places an emphasis on total ecosystem protection with an emphasis on the "High" level of protection.
Proposal 2-XA places an emphasis on contributing to a network of MPAs in the "preferred" size range.
Proposal 2-XA has the support of a vast array of commercial and recreational fishermen/women and divers.

Proposal 2-XA and/or its individual components has the support of many in the conservation community.

Philip (Phil) and Mai Lan Wilson
Mountain Ranch, California 95246

From: Pierre Granier [mailto:im.involved@gmail.com]
Sent: Sunday, March 30, 2008 9:43 AM
To: MLPAComments
Subject: I support proposal 2-XA

Please support Proposal 2-XA as the proposal you choose to send to lawmakers. It is the most fair and reasonable option of those on the table. Proposal 2-XA clearly meets the standards of the process and science indicates that it will accomplish the goals of the MLPA without creating undue hardship to the most people. Please keep in mind that the MLPA was passed as an effort to preserve California resources, not to eliminate their use by its citizens. 2-XA will do this without putting thousands of people out of work and reducing the number of tax dollars the state collects.

Do you want to tell thousands of children across the state that you didn't work to preserve recreational activities for them and their families while also undercutting their education and the future of a good life here in California.

Support 2-XA

Pierre Granier
Californian

From: rricjean@aol.com [mailto:rricjean@aol.com]
Sent: Sunday, March 30, 2008 7:33 PM
To: MLPAComments
Subject: Proposal-2XA

To: The Blue Ribbon Task Force,

My name is Rick Bisio and I am a native Californian whose favorite pastime for the past 45 years has been to fish, hunt, dive, boat and Kayak in California with my family and friends. As a child growing up, my father taught me more than just how to catch a fish, he also taught me about respect for, and conservation of fish and game and their environment, something I have passed along to my two sons, one of which is currently enrolled in the POST Academy for California Fish and Game.

I believe in conservation and the protection of habitat and ask that you support Proposal 2-XA as it encompasses a well balanced and strong conservation program without having a significant adverse socioeconomic impacts on commercial and or recreational fisherpersons and divers while still being able to achieve the scientific and conservation goals of the MLPA and meet the Department of Fish and Game feasibility guidelines.

Proposal 2-XA has a strong framework of marine reserves with seven core areas where a State Marine Reserve serves as the foundation of the MPA cluster and places an emphasis on total ecosystem protection with focus on the "High" level of protection with an emphasis on contributing to a network of MPAs in the "preferred" size range.

Proposal 2-XA provides good solutions at Bodega and Half Moon Bay whereas Proposal 4 would be devastating to the small boater and in reality, create unsafe situations, also, Proposal 4 creates an MPA between Half Moon Bay and Ano Nuevo (in the Central Coast study area) which is not needed to meet Sat conservation guidance and would also have devastating impacts on Pillar Point Harbor and users.

Proposal 2-XA has the support of a vast array of commercial and recreational fisherpersons and Proposal 2-XA, and/or its individual components have the support of many in the conservation community. Proposal 2-XA is the only proposal to create an underwater park at Sea Ranch specifically designed for non-consumptive divers and provides for public access used by consumptive divers south of Stewarts Point, and when coupled with the private lands to the south becomes a keystone MPA in the overall network.

Proposals 13 and 4 impact recreational and commercial users to the highest degree by extending their SMR out to state waters boundry. Only Proposal 2-XA has struck a real balance in this part of the study area which is reflected in a massive support from local residents, land owners, fisherpersons and conservationists.

I urge you to support Proposal 2-XA .

Sincerely,

Rick Bisio
Pacifica, CA

From: Golfish1@aol.com [mailto:Golfish1@aol.com]
Sent: Sunday, March 30, 2008 10:19 AM
To: Mike Chrisman; MLPAComments
Subject: 2XA

Ladies and Gentlemen

First I'd like to thank you for the time, energy and effort you've all spent on the MLPA process. I'd also urge you to support proposal 2 XA. It is a strong and balanced proposal aimed at achieving the conservation goals, healthy fish populations and high level of protection outlined by the MLPA. It has the support of many groups that use this resource, both commercially and recreationally with an adverse economic impact that is far less than any other proposal. I support conservation and protection when in doing so, a fair compromise for all parties concerned is reached; 2 XA accomplishes difficult task. Please back 2XA !

Thank you,
Rick Sturiza
Woodside, Ca.

From: Robert Cubberly [mailto:cubberly@google.com]
Sent: Sunday, March 30, 2008 10:11 PM
To: MLPAComments
Subject: Save the little guy

BRTF

I urge you to approve Proposal 2-XA. It meets and exceeds the science and conservation goals of the MLPA, while incorporating the least socio-economic impact on fishermen, coastal communities and marine related business. It strikes a balance between preservation, conservation, and sustainable use; the other proposals do not.

Proposal 2-XA meets Department of Fish and Game feasibility guidelines and it is enforceable. This is the only proposal to have broad support from a wide range user groups.

Thanks for your Consideration

--

Robert Cubberly
Mountain View, CA

From: Robert Filbrun [<mailto:filbrunrl@sbcglobal.net>]
Sent: Sunday, March 30, 2008 12:12 AM
To: MLPAComments
Subject: Support for MLPA Proposal 2-XA

I support Proposal 2-XA all the way. No other Proposal even comes close to being fair to the sport fisherman or having any balance between usage, sustainability, and protecting our economy. This should be decided by good science and nothing less.

Best regards,

Robert Filbrun

From: Robert Mariano [<mailto:roosterchick@gmail.com>]
Sent: Sunday, March 30, 2008 7:15 AM
To: MLPAComments
Subject: 2-XA

My name is Robert Mariano and I live in Livermore, CA. I wanted to voice my support for Proposal 2-XA. I have a 20 foot fishing boat on a trailer that I use for ocean fishing out of Monterey, Half Moon Bay, and Berkeley. My son, Tony, just turned 5 this year and I look forward to taking him for his first ocean fishing trip this coming summer. My wife wants me to wait until Tony is 8, but I hope to talk her into letting me take him this year. Safty is a concern for me when I go ocean fishing and Proposal 2-XA has good solutions at Half Moon Bay whereas Proposal 4 would be devastating for the small boater (like myself) and actually creates unsafe situations. I am also concerned about the future of ocean fishing off the CA coast, especially for my son, Tony. I believe Proposal 2-XA has a strong backbone of marine reserves with seven core areas where a State Marine Reserve serves as the foundation of the MPA cluster for the protection of future stocks.

Please consider all proposals carefully. Once you have, I believe you will see that Proposal 2-XA is fair for all.

Robert Mariano
Livermore, CA 94550

From: rcramer2@pacbell.net [mailto:rcramer2@pacbell.net]
Sent: Sunday, March 30, 2008 1:06 PM
To: MLPAComments
Cc: governor@governor.ca.gov; mike.chirsman@resources.ca.g
Subject: Support for Proposal 2-XA

As a father and grandfather who cherishes fishing time with my family I am asking that you support proposal 2-XA. I know you will receive numerous letters stating all the reason we support this proposal so I'll keep my comments brief. We know you are doing the best you can to save our fishery and proposal 2-XA is the best balance for everyone concerned. Again, please support 2-XA.

Sincerely,

Rodger Cramer
Discovery Bay, CA

From: Ron Imperiale [mailto:rimperiale@comcast.net]
Sent: Sunday, March 30, 2008 12:52 PM
To: MLPAComments
Subject: 2-xa

Blue Ribbon Task Force;

My name is Ron Imperiale, and as a native Californian and fisherman of 50years, I would like to voice my opion on Proposal 2-XA.

Of all the proposals I feel that this proposal fits the majority of all parties concerned. It achieves the conservation goals of the MPLA, the feasibility guidlines of DFG. It is the only proposal that will garner support from a wide group fishing concerns and still remain enforceable. This proposal also has a strong foundation of marine reserves with seven core areas where a State Marine Reserve serves as the foundation of the MPLA cluster. It places emphasis on total ecosystem protection with a emphasis on "High" level of protection; as well as a emphasis on contributing to a network of MPAs in the "preferred " size range. The proposal has a vast array of commercial and recreational fisherman/women and divers; and its individual components has the support in the conservation community.

Sincerely:

Ron Imperiale
Pleasanton, Ca

From: rllmd94127@aol.com [mailto:rllmd94127@aol.com]
Sent: Sunday, March 30, 2008 11:15 AM
To: MLPAComments
Cc: governor@governor.ca.gov; Mike Chrisman
Subject: note to Blue Ribbon Task force re: support for proposal 2-XA

I am a sportsfisherman in the San Francisco Bay Area and am concerned about the sorry state of current conservation measures for our fisheries, especially regarding Chinook Salmon and Rockfish. My sense is that the big problem for the salmon is the terrible treatment by the state of their spawning grounds, especially in the Sacramento Delta area. That has been pointed out many time previously by concerned fishermen and conservationists much more knowledgeable than myself, so I will say no more on that subject except to lend my support to current proposal "2-XA".

Proposal 2-XA is a well balanced and strong conservation proposal that does not have significant adverse socioeconomic impacts on commercial and/or recreational fishermen and divers but achieves the scientific and conservation goals of the MLPA. Proposal 2-XA meets Department of Fish and Game feasibility guidelines, is enforceable, and will have broad public support. Proposal 2-XA is the only proposal to have broad support from a wide range of fishing user groups.

Proposal 2-XA places an emphasis on total ecosystem protection with an emphasis on the "High" level of protection. Proposal 2-XA places an emphasis on contributing to a network of MPAs in the "preferred" size range. Proposal 2-XA has the support of a vast array of commercial and recreational fishermen/women and divers.

Proposal 2-XA and/or its individual components has the support of many in the conservation community.

Proposal 2-XA would not, as Proposal 4 would, close virtually all recreational bottom fishing at Duxbury Reef - the most important fishing area north of Point Conception and mean the virtual end of fishing out of San Francisco Bay. Proposal 4 also creates an MPA between Half Moon Bay and Ano Nuevo (in the Central Coast study area) which is not needed to meet SAT conservation guidance, with devastating impacts to Pillar Point harbor and users.

Proposal 2-XA has good solutions at Bodega Bay and Half Moon Bay whereas Proposal 4 would be devastating for the small boater and actually creates unsafe situations.

Proposals 4 and 13 both place an MPA at Saunders Reef (an area protected by natural winds and typically rough water) resulting in a disproportionate impact to an area that was severely underrepresented on the Regional Stakeholder Group.

Proposal 2-XA is the only proposal to create an underwater park at Sea Ranch specifically designed for non-consumptive divers while leaving open the traditional public access used by consumptive divers south of Stewarts Point, and when coupled with the private lands to the south becomes a keystone MPA in the overall network.

Proposals 13 and 4 impact recreational and commercial users to the highest degree by extending their SMR out to the state waters boundary. Only Proposal 2-XA has struck a real balance in this part of the study area which is reflected in a massive support from local residents, land owners, fishermen, and conservationists.

Thanks in advance for your attention to, and I hope support for, this most important proposal to help to begin to solve this complex conservation problem.

Ron Lewis

San Francisco

From: Ron Phillips [mailto:boater58@sbcglobal.net]
Sent: Sunday, March 30, 2008 9:43 PM
To: MLPAComments
Subject: Proposal 2-XA

Please do the right thing and adopt proposal 2-XA.
Thank you

From: Rebernhardt@aol.com [mailto:Rebernhardt@aol.com]
Sent: Sunday, March 30, 2008 3:46 PM
To: MLPAComments
Cc: governor@governor.ca.gov; Mike Chrisman
Subject: Support urged for Proposal 2-XA

Dear Sirs,

As lifelong fisherman I urge you to support Proposal 2-XA for the following reasons.

It not only achieves the scientific & conservation goals of the MLPA, but it also considered to be feasible AND enforceable by the DFG, which will also give it broad public support. It addresses protection for the TOTAL ecosystem. And finally Proposal 4 would actually create some unsafe situations for small boaters.

Sincerely,

Ronald Bernhardt
Livermore, Ca

From: Jackie Daniels [mailto:jackiedaniels@comcast.net]
Sent: Sunday, March 30, 2008 8:19 AM
To: MLPAComments
Subject: MLPA/2XA

Hello, my name is Ronald Daniels. I'm a lifelong Californian and have been fishing for 54 years. My dad and mom got me started and that was all it took! While I understand we have many problems in this state, I feel that Prop. 2XA is the best solution to mix fishing and conservation together at this time. Science has showed us this. It's the fair way for all Californians to make this a win-win situation! Thanks for your time.

From: RON & PEGGY LAWRENCE [mailto:ronpeglawrence@sbcglobal.net]
Sent: Sunday, March 30, 2008 12:01 PM
To: MLPAComments
Subject: Support Proposal 2-XA

I urge your support of Proposal 2-XA.

It has the support of responsible scientists and preserves a natural resource that all want to conserve.

The opposing proposals do not pass the cost benefit test. They devastate a recreation beloved by thousands, taking millions of dollars out of our economy with no significantly improved benefit over that of 2-XA.

Thank You

Ronald Lawrence

From: Sam English [mailto:sjenglish@comcast.net]
Sent: Sunday, March 30, 2008 2:33 PM
To: MLPAComments
Subject: Mlpa Proposal 2=XA

Ladies and Gentlemen,

First, I want to thank you for your service to this great State, and in particular to me, one who enjoys fishing, as you work out the details of implementing the Marine Life Protection Act. I agree with the goals that Californians had in mind when they passed this law in 1999. The most important to me are protecting the ecosystem and supporting weak fish stocks. I support MPA's where reasonable, and supported by science. I am a firm believer in conservation, maintaining healthy fish population levels, and not overfishing. I also believe that eating seafood, especially wild, sustainable seafood, is very beneficial for society as a whole, and that this should be a viable choice for all Californians. For this reason, I would like you to support Proposal 2-XA. I believe it to be the most reasonable, achieving the goals of the MLPA, meets DF&G guidelines, puts restrictions where they will help the most - and is supported by sound scientific models, has been peer reviewed by those who most understand the marine ecosystem, and yet still allows for reasonable fishing opportunities - a goal that is not mutually exclusive with the goals of the MLPA. Proposal 2-XA also has the greatest benefits for society as a whole, including those who enjoy seeing nature thrive, and the boating, fishing, seafood, restaurant and tourism industries in California. Furthermore, Proposal 2-XA has the support of a broad spectrum of Californians, including those who fish and those who do not. In

fact, those who fish or who otherwise utilize seafood would really like to see supportable and sustainable fisheries become letter and law, obviously not wanting to kill the "goose that laid the golden egg".

I would be willing to hear your reasoning for the proposal that you finally select, and help spread the word to those in my circle of influence, and lobby the F&G commission for it's acceptance, if it can be shown to be better than Proposal 2-XA for the environment and for society.

Thank you!
Sam English

From: SCOTT BEST [mailto:naniamo@sbcglobal.net]
Sent: Sunday, March 30, 2008 10:03 PM
To: MLPAComments
Subject: Supporting 2-XA,recreational fishing

Hello,

I support this measure,it will insure regulations that will support economic justice for areas dependent on the fishing industry.(not to mention I will continue to purchase a fishing license in the state of calif. a novel idea).

Writing this letter on behalf of all fishermen who love the sport and have paid for this protection of many native fish by purchasing a license from the dept of fish and game.if they continue to sanction recreational fishing to the point of non-existence I will no longer support their efforts by buying a license to fish.It really is that simple.

Thank You ,
Scott B.

From: Scott P. [mailto:santacruzdesign@yahoo.com]
Sent: Sunday, March 30, 2008 8:57 PM
To: MLPAComments
Subject: Support of Proposal 2-XA

Dear Blue Ribbon Task Force,
I am a recreational fisherman that lives with my family of 5 near the harbor in Santa Cruz, CA.
I have unending respect for the environment and take great pride in teaching and sharing my ideals with not only my family but the many friends and families we share this community with.
A major part of our lives revolves around the beaches and waters of the Monterey Bay, including fishing and other water activities. 2 of my daughters will be attending Junior Lifeguards in the very near future. My wife and children have, on several occasions, done their own beach cleanups. We have also been involved with most organized beach cleanup projects here in Santa Cruz.
What I am writing to you about is to stress my support of Proposal 2-XA. I feel it is well balanced and has strong conservation guidelines. It also addresses the significant adverse socioeconomic impact that

other proposals do not consider. I believe that there will be irreversible damage to our local economy and the many families that rely on fishing as their livelihood. I again, stress my full support of Proposal 2-XA, and am hoping you do as well.

Sincerely,
Scott Peterman
Santa Cruz CA.

From: Sheralyn Kirby [mailto:kirby@mcn.org]
Sent: Sunday, March 30, 2008 1:31 PM
To: MLPAComments
Subject: PROPOSAL 2XA

To Whom it may concern,

I am writing to express my support of proposal 2XA. There are several local families which have owned ocean front ranches for generations and have done an excellent job at limiting access to fishing and diving activities. These lands are fenced and patrolled by the land owners and those locals which have been granted permission to pass their property to fish do so with the utmost care and respect for the land owners and marine life. I strongly encourage the government to support these property owners and allow them to continue to remain in control of their property and allow them to continue to use it as their ancestors have for generations.

Sincerely,

Sheralyn Kirby

From: Tim and Sherry [mailto:sherry@humboldt1.com]
Sent: Sunday, March 30, 2008 4:11 PM
To: MLPAComments
Subject: North Central MLPA

I am a woman that loves to fish. I think that proposal 2-XA is the most balanced and well thought out proposal. It would be a shame to keep Californians from having access to the states natural resources. They belong to EVERYONE equally, whether you dive, fish, or just like to look.

Sherry Klassen

From: the.cameras@comcast.net [mailto:the.cameras@comcast.net]
Sent: Sunday, March 30, 2008 10:40 AM
To: MLPAComments
Cc: govenor@govenor.ca.gov
Subject: Recreational Fisherman

I support the proposal 2-XA. It makes the most sense until we can figure out what is really going on.

From: thejohnson5 [mailto:thejohnson5@sbcglobal.net]
Sent: Sunday, March 30, 2008 7:22 PM
To: MLPAComments
Subject: MLPA

I'm writing to support Proposal 2-XA. 2-xa is the best option for recreational, commercial fisherman and divers. It is even the option supported by the public. It achieves the scientific and conservation goals of the MLPA, is the only option supported by several fishing organisations, meets DF&G feasibility guidelines, places an emphasis on contributing to a network of MLPA's in the "preferred" size range, and on the emphasis on the total ecosystem protection with an emphasis on the "high" level of protection. It will also keep it safer for the recreational fisherman by not having him take chances by having to travel further than necessary to get to the last few remaining fishing spots. Please support 2-xa, its the one the recreational fisherman want; we are the backbone of the economy for many coastal towns.

From: Tim [mailto:reelsteel@humboldt1.com]
Sent: Sunday, March 30, 2008 3:31 PM
To: MLPAComments
Subject: North Central MPA's

I have looked over the different proposals for MPA's and I believe that proposal 2-XA is the best proposal. The other proposals, especially #4 penalize users with very little extra to show as far as protection. If your goal is to have balance and to consider people as well as environment then 2-XA is the best proposal. If you only care about few people with nothing to lose either way then I guess you could choose a different proposal. They all provide protection, it just matters how compassionate you are for people. Please select 2-XA .
Tim and Sherry Klassen

From: timandpatty [<mailto:timandpatty@comcast.net>]
Sent: Sunday, March 30, 2008 5:36 PM
To: MLPAComments
Subject: MLPA Proposal 2-XA

I am writing in support of Proposal 2-XA

Proposal 2-XA is a well balanced conservation proposal that does not have significant adverse impacts on commercial or recreational fisherpeople.

This proposal achieves the conservation goals of the MLPA, it meets the DFG feasibility guidelines, and will have broad public support. It has a strong backbone of marine reserve core areas where state state reserve serves as the foundation of the MPA cluster. It places high emphasis on total ecosystem protection. I believe that this proposal will have a vast array of support from both the recreational and commercial fishing communities.

Thank you for your time....

Tim Thomas

From: Tom Chivington [<mailto:tchiv@att.net>]
Sent: Sunday, March 30, 2008 12:44 PM
To: MLPAComments
Cc: governor@governor.ca.gov; mikechrisman@resources.ca.gov
Subject: Salmon Protection Proposals

As a retiree that spends a lot of time in the outdoors using my lifetime fishing license, I think you are on the right track in trying to preserve and protect our wild salmon population. I also believe that proposal 2-XA of the three proposals before you should be the one that is adopted. This proposal does the best job of addressing the problem and still trying to preserve some balance when it comes to protecting and increasing the salmon population as well as retaining some portion of the unique fishery that both recreational and commercial fishermen enjoy. I strongly encourage you adopt proposal 2-XA.

Sincerely,
Tom Chivington

From: Walter Stolar [<mailto:walters886@yahoo.com>]
Sent: Sunday, March 30, 2008 6:36 PM
To: MLPAComments
Subject: Support for Proposal 2-XA

Subject: MLPA Initiatives

Support for Proposal 2-XA

I have been an avid California outdoorsman and conservationist for over 35 of my adult years. I am especially sensitive to the protection of our habitat and natural resources as it our stewardship today that will preserve our natural bounty for future generations of Californians. That is why after reviewing each of the MPLA proposals only Proposal 2-XA represents a careful balance between conservation of the ocean fishery and access.

Most importantly I am in favor of Proposal 2-XA because it balances strong conservation principles based on sound biological science. It is the only proposal that does not have a significant adverse socioeconomic impact on divers, recreational fishermen and fisherwomen and commercial fishermen. Proposal 2-XA is the only proposal that will meet the DFG feasibility guidelines and conservation goals of the MPLA and it is the only proposal that has the broad support of both conservation groups and users.

You have been selected to participate on the Blue Ribbon Task Force because of your experience and passion for conserving our natural resources. I share your same passion so join me endorsing proposal 2-XA as it is the only proposal that balances conservation and ocean access for California citizens.

Thank You,

Walter Stolar
515 South 15th Street
San Jose, CA 95112